

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated April 1, 2004, claims 1, 4-9,11, and 12 are allowed, claims 2 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,366,358 to Satou et al. (hereinafter "Satou"). Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant appreciates the Office Action's finding that claims 1, 4-9,11, and 12 are allowed.

Summary of Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended dependent claims 3 into independent form in accordance with the Examiner's comment, and has amended claim 10 to depend from amended independent claim 3. In addition, Applicant has canceled claim 2 without prejudice or disclaimer from further consideration. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-12 are presently pending for consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 and 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,366,358 to Satou et al., and claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests the reconsideration of amended claims 3 and 10.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer from further consideration. In addition, Applicant has rewritten the objected dependent claim 3 into an independent form including all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended

independent claim 3 is allowable, and thus Applicant respectfully requests the objection of claim 3 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claim 10 has been amended to depend from claim 3, as amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10, as amended, is allowable for its dependency on the allowable amended independent claim 3. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310.

If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above,
such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP



By: David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: June 28, 2004

Customer No. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001